United Nations A/C.1/53/PV.22

General Assembly
Fifty-third session

Official Records

First Committee
22nd Meeting
Tuesday, 3 November 1998, 10 a.m.
New York

Chairman: Mr. Mernier . . . . . (Belgium)

The meeting was called to order at 10 a.m.

Agenda items 63 to 80

Action on all draft resolutions submitted under all items

The Chairman: In accordance with the programme of work and agreed timetable, the Committee will commence today the third stage of its work, action on all draft resolutions submitted under agenda items 63 to 80.

As I informed members of the Committee at the close of our meeting yesterday, the Committee will proceed to take a decision today on the following draft resolutions that appear in the Chairman's revised cluster paper: in cluster 1, A/C.1/53/L.3, "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East"; A/C.1/53/L.14, "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons"; A/C.1/53/L.19, on the consolidation of the regime established by the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean.

Yesterday I said that A/C.1/53/L.21 would be voted on today. That is not now the case, as a delegation objected and asked for action on that draft resolution to be postponed.

In cluster 2, all draft resolutions will be voted on today. That means A/C.1/53/L.6/Rev.1, on the Biological Weapons Convention, and A/C.1/53/L.9, on the dumping of radioactive wastes.

(*spoke in French*)

I call on the representative of Brazil on a point of order.

Mr. Felicio (Brazil): Among the list of draft resolutions to be voted on in cluster 1, I did not hear you, Mr. Chairman, list A/C.1/53/L.37, entitled "Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas". I understood you to say yesterday that the Committee would be voting on draft resolutions in cluster 1 today, and that draft resolution is in cluster 1. In our meeting yesterday I did not hear any delegation object to its being voted on today. I kindly ask for some clarification.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): Yesterday I asked all delegations wishing to postpone the voting on any draft resolutions to so inform the Secretariat. That was done for draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.37. Members will have heard the question asked by Brazil. Does any delegation in the room object to draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.37 being put to the vote today? The request from Brazil is that if a delegation objects it should so state in this room.

I call on the representative of Japan.

Mr. Hayashi (Japan): Our delegation asked for the postponement of action on that draft resolution because we have not yet got instructions from Tokyo.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): That I think answers Brazil's question.

I call on the representative of Brazil.

98-86296 (E)

This record contains the original texts of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

Mr. Felicio (Brazil): Of course, if delegations need some time to request instructions and to reflect upon draft resolutions, my delegation would not have any problem with that. I would just like to point out that the draft resolution on the southern hemisphere has been on the table for some weeks now, and it was my understanding that we had plenty of time to consult our capitals. Yesterday was a holiday in Brazil, and we had other important draft resolutions to vote on today. I went to my office at the end of the afternoon and had to wake up some people in Brazil to request instructions in order to be able to vote today on draft resolutions that we were expected to take action on today. But if delegations need more time, then that is fine with the delegation of Brazil. I would just like you, Mr. Chairman, to inform us when it will be possible to put the draft resolution on the southern hemisphere, in document A/C.1/53/L.37, to a vote.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): The vote on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.37 will be deferred.

I have just been told that a delegation objects to the Committee's voting today on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.3. In accordance with the rules of procedure, A/C.1/53/L.3 will therefore not be put to the vote today.

Very briefly I should like to return to cluster 1. We are now left with only two draft resolutions to vote on in cluster 1. I renew my appeal to all delegations to show prudence when seeking the postponement of draft resolutions. It would be unreasonable to ask that 90 per cent of the draft resolutions in a cluster be postponed.

I call on the representative of Malaysia.

Mr. Abdullah Faiz (Malaysia): My delegation is in a similar position to that of the delegation of Brazil in that it did not ask for the deferral of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.45. In this regard I, too, would like to have some clarification.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of Egypt.

Mr. Karem (Egypt): I am sorry I was not in the room, but I have been told by my colleague that you announced that a delegation has requested the deferral of action on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.3. Am I right in this understanding?

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): That is indeed so.

Mr. Karem (Egypt): In that case, may I ask what delegation that is. I would like to say that there are no ongoing consultations on this particular draft resolution. Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.3 was submitted a long time ago and was introduced under a somewhat specific and different agenda item. But, in the spirit of compromise, we will not stand in the way of that request and will honour it for 24 hours. If there is a request for a deferral of action on A/C.1/53/L.3 we will not stand in the way today but would request that you, Mr. Chairman, put that draft resolution to the vote tomorrow. I hope that within these 24 hours the delegation requesting deferral will have solved the problem that caused it to request the deferral.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): We shall now proceed with the list of draft resolutions to be put to the vote today.

(spoke in English)

Under cluster 2, "Other weapons of mass destruction": we have draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.6/Rev.1, on biological weapons; A/C.1/53/L.9, on radioactive wastes, A/C.1/53/L.28, on the Geneva Protocol, and A/C.1/53/L.38/Rev.1, on chemical weapons. Under cluster 3, we have draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.40, on the prevention of an arms race in outer space. Under cluster 4, "Conventional weapons", we have draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.7, "Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and collecting them", and A/C.1/53/L.41/Rev.1, "Illicit traffic in small arms". Finally, in cluster 5, on regional disarmament and security, we will examine today all three draft resolutions: A/C.1/53/L.23, "Regional disarmament"; A/C.1/53/L.34, "Regional disarmament"; and A/C.1/53/L.35, "Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels".

Are there any comments?

Before we proceed, I should like to review once again the procedure I outlined yesterday for this stage of the Committee's work. I apologize to delegations which were present yesterday, but I shall repeat it for all delegations present today.

At the outset of each meeting delegations will have an opportunity to introduce revised draft resolutions. Then I will call upon those delegations wishing to make general statements or comments on the draft resolutions in a particular cluster, other than explanations of their position or vote. Before we address draft resolutions in a particular

cluster, delegations will have the opportunity to make general statements on the cluster.

Thereafter delegations may proceed to explain their position or vote on the draft resolution before a decision is taken. After the Committee has taken a decision on a draft resolution, I will call upon those delegations wishing to explain their position or vote on the draft resolution after the decision has been taken. Therefore, delegations will have two opportunities to make comments on a particular draft resolution, either before or after a vote is taken on.

In accordance with the rules of procedure, sponsors of draft resolutions are not permitted to make statements in explanation of vote. They are allowed only to make general statements at the beginning of the meeting or with regard to a new cluster. In order to avoid misunderstandings, I urge those delegations wishing to request a recorded vote on any particular draft resolution to inform the Secretariat of their intention before the Committee begins its action on any individual cluster.

With regard to any deferral of action on any draft resolution, delegations should inform the Secretariat in advance. Every effort should be made to refrain from resorting to a deferral of action. I hope that these procedures are clear to all delegations.

Are there any comments or questions?

I call on the representative of Brazil.

Mr. Felício (Brazil): A point of clarification: Mr. Chairman, when you say that delegations are requested to inform the Secretariat in advance of their wish to postpone voting on draft resolutions, are you referring to the sponsors of draft resolutions or to any delegation? It is my understanding that anyone has the right to request a postponement, but if it is not a sponsor it has to be done from the floor so that everybody knows who is asking for the deferral of a decision. That is my understanding, but perhaps you could enlighten me.

Since I have the floor, I should like to request of you and the Secretariat that the voting on the draft resolution on the southern hemisphere, document A/C.1/53/L.37, be put to a vote tomorrow.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): The answer to your first question is that each and every delegation has the right to ask that a vote be deferred on any draft resolution. Each delegation has that right.

I now call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Delegations will find among their documents two important INF documents. The first one is A/C.1/53/INF/2. This document contains the additional sponsors of original draft resolutions, whether revised or original. So we can see a hard number of additional sponsors of the long list of draft resolutions. During the action period I will not read out all those additional sponsors but will only refer to this document. Therefore, from now on, if delegations want to add sponsors they should so indicate, so that we can make a list and announce them from the podium.

The second important document is A/C.1/53/INF/3. This document contains a consolidated corrigendum for draft resolutions and decisions. The purpose of all this is to try to facilitate our work and economize in the cost to the Organization, because some draft resolutions will have only very slight editorial errors requiring only slight revisions or changes. Those are the two documents I should like to draw to the attention of delegations.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): Before we proceed to the vote on draft resolutions in cluster 1, does any delegation wish to introduce a revised draft resolution?

(*spoke in English*)

If not, the Committee will now proceed to take decisions on draft resolutions listed in cluster 1. I shall call first on those delegations wishing to make general statements on cluster 1.

Mr. Tongprasroeth (Thailand): Nuclear disarmament is a matter to which Thailand has always attached great importance. One essential element to help make this world a safer place for us and for future generations is to stop both vertical and horizontal nuclear proliferation. However, Thailand believes that in order to achieve the ultimate goal of nuclear disarmament we must go beyond the concept of non-proliferation and work together towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons. Hence, it is the duty both of nuclear-weapon States and of non-nuclear-weapon States to rigorously pursue sincere efforts and genuine steps towards that end. This notion, we trust, is shared by all members of the international community.

In this light, Thailand supports the various initiatives on nuclear non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament which call on the nuclear-weapon States to accelerate the process

of nuclear disarmament in fulfilment of their obligations under article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and the obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control. We also support the call for the cessation of further development and accumulation of nuclear stockpiles.

Thailand also fully supports the concept of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various parts of the world where the parties concerned concur on such a decision. For our part, Thailand has joined others in undertaking the obligations under the NPT not to acquire nuclear weapons. We, along with nine other countries in South-East Asia, signed the Bangkok Treaty establishing the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone. The Treaty entered into force on 27 March 1997, and we hope that the five nuclear-weapon States will sign and ratify the protocol to the Treaty at the earliest possible date.

With a clear conscience, and in demonstration of our commitment to the objective of the total elimination of nuclear weapons, this year Thailand has decided to co-sponsor five draft resolutions in cluster 1 related to nuclear weapons. Although these draft resolutions understandably differ from one another, what is important is that they reflect more or less the principle of nuclear disarmament, to which Thailand adheres.

We would like to take this opportunity to reiterate our support for these draft resolutions: A/C.1/53/L.2, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia", introduced by Kyrgyzstan; A/C.1/53/L.37 entitled "Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas", introduced by Brazil; A/C.1/53/L.45, entitled "Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the *Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons*", introduced by Malaysia; A/C.1/53/L.47, entitled "Nuclear disarmament", introduced by Myanmar; and A/C.1/53/L.48, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: the need for a new agenda", introduced by Ireland.

Apart from those draft resolutions, we also stand ready to support draft resolutions leading to the same goal of totally eliminating nuclear weapons and freeing the world from the nuclear threat.

Mr. Goonetilleke (Sri Lanka): First, the delegation of Sri Lanka is among those that have sponsored draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.47, introduced by the delegation of Myanmar. Such a draft resolution was first presented to the General Assembly in 1995, a landmark year, from the perspective of the majority of us, in nuclear non-proliferation, for that was the year when the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) was reviewed and extended indefinitely.

The General Assembly has before it a number of draft resolutions dealing with the subject of nuclear non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament. This in itself is an indication of the importance attached by the international community to the subject. There are many reasons for the interest in nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament. One such reason is the realization that, having lived in a world bursting with nuclear weapons for more than half a century, this inhumane weapon of mass destruction should not be passed on to future generations. My delegation is in agreement with several other delegations that have pointed out during the course of our discussions that among the many draft resolutions before us, the draft resolution in document A/C.1/53/L.47 is by far the most comprehensive one before the First Committee. Most importantly, it makes an attempt to chart the road we should all take with a view to ridding the world of the most abhorrent weapon of mass destruction. For this reason, we are grateful to the delegation of Myanmar for introducing draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.47 and would urge all members to vote in favour of it.

Secondly, on behalf of the States members of the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC), Sri Lanka is pleased to introduce document A/C.1/53/L.52, containing amendments to the draft resolution on nuclear testing, presented in document A/C.1/53/L.22.

On 2 November the representative of Australia introduced the draft resolution on nuclear testing and in doing so explained the reasons which prompted the sponsors to submit the draft resolution. Likewise, my delegation wishes to brief representatives in the Committee on the rationale behind the amendments contained in this document.

The first amendment is in respect of the fifth preambular paragraph, which recalls Security Council resolution 1172 (1998). The title of the draft resolution is "Nuclear testing", a subject upon which the First Committee and the General Assembly, as well as other institutions such as the Conference on Disarmament, have deliberated. That being the case, the States members of SAARC are of the view that it is inappropriate to make

reference only to the resolution adopted by the Security Council and ignore other resolutions adopted by more representative bodies such as the General Assembly. The amendment would recall all previous resolutions on nuclear testing adopted by the United Nations.

The second amendment is in respect of operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution. The amended version expresses concern over and deplores all nuclear tests, irrespective of the purpose for which they have been conducted. Moreover, the amendment urges the cessation of all such tests in the future.

The majority of us are parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and signatories to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT). However, we have recognized the fact that a number of countries are not parties to these two international instruments. It is therefore inappropriate for us to view the situation through the prism of the NPT and the CTBT only. We have to recognize the fact that there is another point of view and a real situation to deal with.

It is true that the Security Council, on 6 June this year, adopted resolution 1172 (1998) on nuclear testing. It is also true that alarm was expressed at various levels on the developments which began to unfold in May this year. However, we cannot overlook the fact that a careful examination of the situation was made by a group of eight countries soon after the nuclear testing, which is reflected in document A/53/138. Furthermore, the world's second most representative body after the General Assembly — the summit of the non-aligned countries meeting at Durban at the level of heads of State barely two months ago — having gone through a painstaking effort, made its pronouncement, which is reflected in paragraph 113 of the Final Document of the twelfth summit of the Non-Aligned Movement. This point of view was not reached in isolation from the nuclear testing referred to in the draft resolution or the pronouncements made on that testing at various forums. The relevant paragraphs of the Final Document are important, as they not only express concern at the testing but also provide a solution to the problems confronting the international community in the field of nuclear non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament.

In view of the above, my delegation, on behalf of the States members of SAARC, would earnestly request all members of the Committee to support the amendments in document A/C.1/53/L.52. In doing so we should bear in mind the fact that the nuclear testing referred to in draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 is behind us; that many positive developments have taken place since then due to the consultations and negotiations between the two countries and other interested parties; that the political and security climate in the subcontinent has improved considerably since then; and, above all, that commitments have been made by the parties concerned to the effect that the nuclear testing we have witnessed will be the last to be conducted there. It is time for us to look with confidence to the future and not the past.

Mr. Purbo (Indonesia): Concerted international endeavours to achieve the goal of nuclear disarmament should be pursued under the auspices of the Conference on Disarmament, the only multilateral negotiating forum. We earnestly hope that the members of that forum at its 1999 session will respond constructively to the call in draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.47 and establish, on a priority basis, an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament, taking into account relevant proposals, *inter alia*, the one submitted by its 28 members for a programme of action for the elimination of nuclear weapons. In this light, Indonesia supports Myanmar's draft resolution on nuclear disarmament, in document A/C.1/53/L.47.

The international community continues to call for a comprehensive approach that would lead to the ultimate goal of the elimination of nuclear weapons. The advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the *Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons*, in our view, is legally authoritative. It has placed the obligation on the nuclear-weapon States to conclude negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament. Hence, Indonesia gives its full support to Malaysia's draft resolution, document A/C.1/53/L.45.

The trend towards nuclear-weapon-free zones in recent years is evidence of the significant advancement of the cause of global non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament. In this context, Indonesia supports the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and welcomes the decision of Mongolia to declare its territory a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

Mr. Mesdoua (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation wishes to express its opinion on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.47, entitled "Nuclear disarmament", introduced by Myanmar. My country has co-sponsored such draft resolutions for the past three years. My delegation has always supported efforts to achieve nuclear disarmament, and, once again co-sponsoring the draft resolution on this subject, we renew our support for all such efforts. In the present circumstances, marked by

recent developments in South Asia, we feel this is particularly appropriate.

In the draft resolution the co-sponsors are trying to express a long-held desire of the international community, which adopted the first resolution on nuclear disarmament in 1948. The indefinite extension of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation (NPT) of Nuclear Weapons in 1995, the signing of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty by more than 150 States to date and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the *Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons* of 8 July 1996, which unanimously reaffirmed that all States are obligated to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control — all these developments clearly express the will of the international community in this regard.

Though the NPT, an important legal disarmament instrument, has often been criticized for its imperfections and its discriminatory regime, and despite the lack of results from the second session of the Preparatory Committee for the 2000 Review Conference, Algeria and the other sponsors of this initiative, which we think is the most comprehensive one, wishes faithfully to express its view of nuclear disarmament as reflected and reaffirmed recently by the non-aligned countries at their summit meeting in Durban.

Our co-sponsorship of this draft resolution reflects our view of nuclear disarmament. Algeria today wishes to say that the possession of nuclear weapons can no longer be justified. Laboratory simulations must cease, and the argument of nuclear deterrence is baseless. The establishment of an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament, as requested in paragraph 9 of the draft resolution, is in our opinion an important step towards achieving collective security without excluding anyone out and a world as free of nuclear weapons as it was before 1945.

Algeria, having made a proposal in Geneva along these lines, today wishes to express its satisfaction that the Conference on Disarmament has found consensus and reached an understanding on the establishment of an ad hoc committee on fissile materials. That is why we call on all delegations to give wholehearted and unanimous support to this draft resolution, which we think is the most comprehensive and best reflects our concerns.

I am also pleased to say that my delegation supports and is a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.45, on the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice regarding the use of nuclear weapons, which was introduced by Malaysia. We also call for unanimous and wholehearted support for this draft resolution.

Mr. Thapa (Nepal): I welcome this opportunity to give our support to the draft resolution entitled "Nuclear disarmament", document A/C.1/53/L.47, introduced to the Committee by the representative of Myanmar. In our view, the draft resolution deals with an issue which deserves the highest priority: the question of nuclear disarmament. The draft presented, among other things, places emphasis on two important aspects: a phased programme of nuclear disarmament and comprehensiveness.

As a sponsor of this draft resolution, my delegation honestly desires that the draft be adopted with overwhelming support, if not by consensus.

Mongolia's endeavour to achieve single-State nuclear-weapon-free status seems to be a new concept that certainly merits due consideration. Since this idea is in conformity with the declaration on principles of international law concerning friendly relations and cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, it is the wish of my delegation that draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.10/Rev.1, entitled "Mongolia's international security and nuclear-weapon-free status", be adopted by acclamation.

Mr. Benítez Versón (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation would like to take this opportunity to refer briefly to three draft resolutions in cluster 1, "Nuclear weapons".

Cuba considers that the draft resolution on nuclear disarmament, A/C.1/53/L.47, sponsored by Myanmar, is one of the most important texts that the General Assembly will be adopting this year. We are co-sponsoring A/C.1/53/L.47 because we think it faithfully reflects Cuba's position on this subject.

It is important to point out that the draft resolution reiterates the highest priority accorded to nuclear disarmament in the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly. It recognizes the complementary nature of bilateral and multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament, as well as the fact that bilateral negotiations should never be allowed to replace multilateral negotiations on this subject. The

Conference on Disarmament must, as a matter of priority, establish a special committee on nuclear disarmament to begin negotiations on a gradual global programme of nuclear disarmament with a view to the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons within a fixed time-frame.

Another important matter that the Committee will be taking up in this cluster is the conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. If we want to have effective international arrangements to give the so-called negative guarantees, then those guarantees must not be discriminatory or subject to conditions. My delegation appeals to all States, especially the nuclear-weapon States, to try to agree on a common formula to be negotiated at the Conference on Disarmament. My delegation is convinced that a multilateral agreement that is binding and universal prohibiting the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons would contribute to the elimination of the nuclear threat and would create a climate propitious for negotiations leading to the elimination of nuclear weapons.

Finally, we wish to refer to the draft resolution on the Treaty of Tlatelolco, document A/C.1/53/L.19, an important text that Cuba has decided to co-sponsor once again this year. Cuba recognizes that the Treaty of Tlatelolco is of historic importance in efforts to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons and promote international peace and security. For reasons outside the control of my country, Cuba has been unable to accede fully to this Treaty. When we signed the Treaty in 1995, the Government of Cuba said,

> "The obstacles that have so far prevented the full accession of the Republic of Cuba to the Treaty of Tlatelolco are still present and continue to affect Cuban security. The only nuclear Power in this part of the world, the United States of America, has maintained a policy of hostility against Cuba."

That policy, far from diminishing, has been intensifying since that time, with new hostile acts being committed against my country.

We hope that this year the draft resolutions to which I have referred will receive maximum support from delegations.

Mr. Than (Myanmar): I have sought the floor to offer the comments of my delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.10/Rev.1, entitled "Mongolia's international security and nuclear-weapon-free status". It is our conviction that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the countries of the region concerned and nuclear-weapon-free countries in various parts of the world constitutes an effective measure to prevent the geographic proliferation of nuclear weapons and contributes to the advancement of the cause of nuclear disarmament.

In this connection, Mongolia has taken the commendable and bold step of declaring its territory a nuclear-weapon-free zone. Heads of State or Government of the non-aligned countries, at the Durban non-aligned summit meeting in September this year, welcomed and supported Mongolia's initiative to institutionalize its single-State nuclear-weapon-free zone. Myanmar is an ardent supporter of the establishment of such nuclear-weapon-free zones, both multi-State and single-State. Accordingly, I welcome and support Mongolia's decision to establish on its territory a single-State nuclear-weapon-free zone.

We hope that draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.10/Rev.1 will enjoy the widest possible support of the Member States of the United Nations and that it will be adopted without a vote.

Mr. Seibert (Germany): With regard to cluster 1, I wish to express Germany's strong commitment to nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, a process that requires unilateral, bilateral and multilateral efforts. That is why Germany has co-sponsored draft resolutions A/C.1/53/L.49, introduced by Russia and the United States, and A/C.1/53/L.42, introduced by Japan.

The agenda for nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation is set out in the principles and objectives of the 1995 Review and Extension and Conference. The first major achievement on this road was the conclusion of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT). We strongly support draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.11, introduced by Australia, Mexico and New Zealand, which calls upon States to contribute to its entry into force at the earliest possible date.

The next step, long overdue, is the conclusion of a fissile material cut-off treaty. Germany strongly supports draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.24, on fissile material cut-off negotiations, introduced by Canada. Such negotiations and a resulting fissile material cut-off treaty would constitute a major contribution both to nuclear disarmament and to nuclear non-proliferation.

The draft resolution before us is factual and faithfully reflects the decisions taken on the subject this year by the Conference on Disarmament. It does not prejudge in any way the substance of future negotiations. We therefore hope that the draft resolution will be adopted by consensus and that delegations will refrain from introducing controversial elements. Such elements should be addressed in the course of negotiations and not in the First Committee. Germany hopes that substantive negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty will begin immediately at the outset of next year's Conference on Disarmament session.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): May I point out to delegations that one delegation has asked for the postponement of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.40, on prevention of an arms race in outer space.

Tomorrow the Committee will be taking up draft resolutions in clusters 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10, and we will also be taking up, if there are no objections and at the specific request of two delegations, draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.3, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East", and A/C.1/53/L.37, entitled "Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas". I have also just been told that A/C.1/53/L.10, entitled "Mongolia's international security and nuclear-weapon-free status", can be taken up tomorrow.

In order to make it possible for the First Committee to work as efficiently as possible, may I draw the attention of delegations to the following rules. If delegations wish to postpone action on a draft resolution they must inform the Secretariat the day before the scheduled voting. Otherwise, it will be impossible to accede to such a request on the day of the voting. We cannot ask delegations to bow to last-minute requests, especially not just before the voting, as has happened today. If representatives wish a postponement of voting scheduled for, say, tomorrow, then that must be made known today before 6 p.m. If there is no such request regarding a given draft resolution, then that draft resolution will be put to the vote tomorrow.

I remind delegations that tomorrow we will be taking up in cluster 1, draft resolutions A/C.1/53/L.3, A/C.1/53/L.10 and A/C.1/53/L.37, as well as all the draft resolutions in clusters 6 to 10.

I call on the representative of Pakistan on a point of order.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): I apologize for interrupting my colleague from Japan. May I raise a question about the procedure that has just been outlined by you, Mr. Chairman, with regard to the possible postponement of action on draft resolutions. I understand that there is a 24-hour rule to the effect that when a new draft resolution or amendment is presented, any delegation has the right to ask for a 24-hour postponement in order to receive instructions.

At the same time, with many draft resolutions that are in the process of negotiation, it may not be possible sometimes to decide until the last minute whether or not such draft resolutions will be put to the vote. Suppose negotiations do not succeed and delegations request a postponement of the voting. I think that our rules of procedure allow the possibility of such a postponement. We must retain that flexibility and not resort to a mechanical process which will stall the process of negotiations, a natural part of the voting process in the Committee. I just wished to bring that to your attention, Mr. Chairman, and I hope that that is the understanding on which we will be proceeding.

The Chairman: What I explained is not in contradiction of what you have just said. If there is a new draft resolution or a new revision, then representatives have the 24-hour rule applied. There is no problem about that. If there are consultations, delegations can just ask for a postponement, but I ask delegations to ask for a postponement in case of doubt so that we know how many and what draft resolutions will be put to a vote the next day. In case of doubt in ongoing consultations among delegations, then delegations should just inform us that they want a postponement. That is just to allow an orderly way of working in the Committee. That does not cancel the right of any delegation to ask for a postponement.

I call on the representative of south Africa.

Mr. Goosen (South Africa): I wish to speak in support of the representative of Pakistan. It is my understanding also that if consultations are continuing on a draft resolution, then at any time a delegation — and it can be any delegation in this room and not necessarily a sponsor — can ask for a delay of the voting. That would also be the case if a delegation, for example, had not yet received final instructions for the voting. The proposal that you, Mr. Chairman, have made we could possibly make the preferred option, but it would create difficulties in the Committee if it were to be made a firm rule. If a delegation wishes to request a delay in the voting on a draft resolution it would be difficult and improper and would place

delegations in a very difficult position if they were unable to have their request granted — even if that request were made on the day of the voting. We could, of course, ask such delegations to try to limit that practice to the absolute minimum. I say that while knowing full well that the South African delegation has no intention of asking for a delay of any vote. We have no instructions along those lines, and we have received full instructions. But in all fairness it was necessary for me to support the representative of Pakistan.

The main point I wish to make is that while I agree with you, Mr. Chairman, that that should be the preferred option, I do not think it is a rule that can be enforced if delegations find themselves in that difficult position.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I should like to repeat what I said after the statement made by Pakistan. If delegations are engaged in negotiations and consider that they will not be in a position to vote the following day, then delegations should inform the Secretariat that they want a deferral. That does not in any way prevent delegations from asking for a deferral on the previous day. What I would like is that by 6 p.m. on the day before, we should be informed of requests for deferral so that the Chair and other delegations will have an idea of what will be put to the vote the following day. Of course, the right to seek deferral and the 24-hour rule if there is a new text are not affected by what I have proposed.

I now call on the representative of Japan to introduce a revised draft resolution.

Mr. Hayashi (Japan): I wish to introduce, on behalf of the 49 sponsors, draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.13/Rev.1, entitled "Small arms" under cluster 4. I begin by expressing my sincere appreciation to the additional sponsors that have signed the sponsors' list since the introduction of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.13.

I introduced the original draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.13 on 28 October. Since then we have received some comments on the draft resolution. The revisions in A/C.1/53/L.13/Rev.1 are the outcome of intensive consultations among interested delegations and the sponsors. I wish to express my sincere appreciation for their valuable contributions and flexibility.

In this revision some changes are made in the text. We have made the text clearer, more practical and more consistent, especially in operative paragraphs 3 (a) and (b). Furthermore, we deleted the last two lines of the original operative paragraph 5, referring to a database, the mention of which in A/C.1/53/L.13 was considered by a number of delegations to be premature.

These are the revisions proposed for the original draft resolution in document A/C.1/53/L.13. It is the wish of the sponsors that this revised draft resolution, A/C.1/53/L.13/Rev.1, should command the overwhelming support of the Committee.

The Chairman: I call on the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic on a point of order.

Mr. Bjarme (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would like to return to the point made by the representatives of Pakistan and South Africa. I wish to say that there are some draft resolutions, as the representative of South Africa explained, that call for time because of the delicate nature of the topic.

Your decision, Mr. Chairman, on our method of work is strict and severe and does not correspond to the rules of procedure. You have asked that we make requests for deferral 24 hours in advance. Some countries experience difficulty in getting instructions. Given that the voting on all draft resolutions will be completed on the 13 November, if we finish all the clusters tomorrow, what will we be doing between then and the 13th? That is why we ask the Chair to be more flexible so as to give delegations more time because these decisions are basically political ones.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I should like to repeat once again, so that everyone is clear; if delegations are not ready, we are asking them to inform us the previous day. If there is any doubt they should tell us the previous day. That is in order to make it possible for us to proceed in an orderly manner. If delegations have any doubts, or have no instructions, or are engaged in negotiations, please let us know. That is all the Chair seeks from delegations.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on the various draft resolutions. The first draft resolution to be voted on is A/C.1/53/L.14, under agenda item 72 (e), and is entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons".

(*spoke in English*)

I first call on the representative of China, who wishes to speak in explanation of vote before the voting.

Mr. Li Changhe (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): In the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.14, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons", the Chinese delegation will abstain. The reasons for China's position are as follows.

China has always stood for the comprehensive prohibition and total destruction of all nuclear weapons. On the basis of that fundamental position, China has no difficulty with the substance of this draft resolution and has voted in favour of such resolutions in the past. However, since the beginning of this year there have been changes in the situation relating to the draft resolution in question. The sponsors of the draft resolution have for years been championing nuclear disarmament and have stood for the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. Nevertheless — despite the conclusion of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) and the international community's consensus support for nuclear non-proliferation and the prohibition of nuclear tests — last May one of the sponsors conducted nuclear tests in a blatant fashion, proclaiming itself to be a nuclear State. In view of the contradiction between the action and the advocacy of the sponsor, the incongruousness of its words and deeds, we cannot but have doubts about the sincerity of that sponsor. Therefore, the Chinese delegation will abstain in the voting on this draft resolution.

The Chairman: If no other delegation wishes to explain its position or vote before action is taken, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.14.

A separate, recorded vote on the eighth preambular paragraph has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to the voting on the eighth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.14.

Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.14, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons" was introduced by the representative of India at the 18th meeting, on 29 October 1998. Besides the sponsors listed in the draft resolution, additional sponsors are listed in document A/C.1/53/INF/2. The Republic of the Congo has also become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Marshall Islands, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Chile, Cyprus, Ecuador, Georgia, Israel, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Malta, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, San Marino, Ukraine

The eighth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.14 was retained by 72 votes to 38, with 18 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Sri Lanka informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour; the delegation of the Marshall Islands had intended to abstain.]

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of Benin.

Mr. Amehou (Benin) (*interpretation from French*): I wish to point out that my vote was not properly recorded.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): The Secretariat will take note.

I call on the representative of Algeria.

Mr. Mesdoua (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): I just want to ask that in future the Secretariat read out on exactly which paragraphs delegations are voting so as to avoid all misunderstandings and the taking of positions that might not be consistent with their intentions.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I call now on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.14 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, China, Cyprus, Ecuador, Georgia, Israel, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Malta, Marshall Islands, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, San Marino, Turkmenistan, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.14, as a whole, was adopted by 82 votes to 37, with 20 abstentions.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes or positions.

Mr. King (United States of America): As we do each year on such draft resolutions, the United States voted "no" on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.14. The United States would never, notwithstanding its commitment to nuclear disarmament, negotiate, approve or sign a convention of the type called for in this draft resolution. Such a convention is simply not a practical approach to the ultimate goal of nuclear disarmament. The considerable progress towards that goal that has been achieved to date has been made by a realistic step-by-step process that embraces bilateral, unilateral and multilateral measures. My delegation is convinced that this process can continue to bear fruit in the years ahead.

We note that this year's version has dropped the annex section of last year's, which contained a draft convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. Could it be that the sponsor of this draft resolution is no longer interested in the convention which would have prohibited the development, production and stockpiling of nuclear weapons as called for in the draft convention's fifth preambular paragraph? Is it possible that the sponsor of the draft resolution is no longer willing to use the phrase "the five nuclear-weapon States", which appeared in article 3, paragraph 3 of the draft convention in resolution 52/39 C? We wonder.

Mr. Hayashi (Japan): I should like to explain Japan's abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.14, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons". Japan, which has sorrowful experience of atomic bombings, fervently desires that the use of nuclear weapons, which causes incomparable human suffering, will never be repeated and firmly believes that

continuous efforts should be made towards a world free of nuclear weapons.

Having said that, as far as draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.14 is concerned, I should like to state Japan's conviction that the only way for us to realize a world free of nuclear weapons, in the present international reality, is to achieve steady and step-by-step progress in nuclear non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament. For that purpose Japan attaches particular importance to the strengthening of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) regime, to the early conclusion of negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty and to the concrete efforts made by the five nuclear-weapon States for nuclear disarmament. Furthermore, Japan advocates multilateral discussions on possible future steps, as draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.42, entitled "Nuclear disarmament with a view to the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons", provides in its operative paragraph 4.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.19, under agenda item 77, which is entitled "Consolidation of the regime established by the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean (Treaty of Tlatelolco)".

As it seems that no members of the Committee wish to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken on the draft resolution, I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.19. The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote.

The Chairman: If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.19 was adopted.

The Chairman: If no delegation wishes to explain its position on the draft resolution just adopted, the Committee will now consider draft resolutions listed under cluster 2, "Other weapons of mass destruction".

The first draft resolution in that cluster is A/C.1/53/L.6/Rev.1, under agenda item 78, and it is entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction".

The second draft resolution is A/C.1/53/L.9, entitled "Prohibition of the dumping of radioactive wastes".

The third draft resolution is A/C.1/53/L.28, entitled "Measures to uphold the authority of the 1925 Geneva Protocol".

The last draft resolution in that cluster is A/C.1/53/L.38/Rev.1, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction".

If no delegation wishes to make a general statement, other than an explanation of its position or vote, on draft resolutions contained in this cluster, the Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.6/Rev.1, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction".

Does any delegation wish to explain its position or vote before a decision is taken? I see none.

The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.6/Rev.1 have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.6/Rev.1, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction", was introduced by the representative of Hungary at the 18th meeting, on 29 October 1998. Besides the sponsors listed in the draft resolution, additional sponsors are listed in document A/C.1/53/INF/2. The Republic of the congo has also become a sponsor.

In connection with this draft resolution, I should like to read out the following statement on behalf of the Secretary-General:

"By paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.6/Rev.1, the General Assembly would

request the Secretary-General to continue to render the necessary assistance to the depositary Governments of the Convention and to provide such services as may be required for the implementation of the decisions and recommendations of the Review Conferences, as well as the decisions contained in the final report of the Special Conference, including all necessary assistance to the Ad Hoc Group. It should be noted that the Review Conferences and the Special Conference are conferences of the States parties to the Convention. As was the case in the past, conferences of multilateral disarmament treaties, for instance the Seabed Treaty and the Environmental Modification Convention (ENMOD) include in their rules of procedure provisions concerning the arrangements for meeting the cost of the conferences, including the sessions of preparatory committees. Under those arrangements no additional cost was borne by the regular budget of the Organization. Accordingly, the Secretary-General considers that his mandate under draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.6/Rev.1 to render the necessary assistance and required services for the implementation of the decisions and recommendations of the Review Conferences and the Special Conference has no financial implications for the regular budget of the United Nations and that associated costs would be met in accordance with the financial arrangements to be made by the conference of the Convention. The Committee's attention is drawn to the established practice that all activities related to the international conventions or treaties which under their respective legal instruments are to be financed outside the regular budget of the United Nations may only be undertaken when sufficient resources to cover the activities in question have been received from the States parties in advance."

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I have heard no objection to the draft resolution being adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.6/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): The Committee will now take action on the second draft resolution in cluster 2, document A/C.1/53/L.9, on agenda item 71 (l). The draft resolution is entitled "Prohibition of the dumping of radioactive wastes".

If no delegations wish to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken, I shall call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.9, entitled "Prohibition of the dumping of radioactive wastes", was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the 16th meeting, on 27 October 1998. Besides the sponsor listed in the draft resolution, an additional sponsor is listed in document A/C.1/53/INF/2.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote.

If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.9 was adopted.

The Chairman: I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted.

Ms. Kunadi (India): My delegation has been fully supportive of the central objective of this draft resolution and has therefore joined the consensus. India was one country among the few that had requested the retention of the question of radiological weapons on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament, as we believe that the international community must remain vigilant to the grave dangers posed by nuclear or radioactive waste and the possibility of their military use.

Operative paragraph 8 of the draft resolution refers to the Joint Convention on the Safety of Spent Fuel Management and on the Safety of Radioactive Waste Management. As a developing country, India attaches great importance not only to the safety but also to the full utilization of all aspects of the fuel cycle to derive maximum benefits. Therefore, spent fuel is not waste but is also a valuable resource. Besides, the Joint Convention suffers from the drawback that it does not cover military wastes which are relevant in the context of radiological weapons. Therefore, we would have reservations on operative paragraph 8.

Mr. Benítez Versón (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation supported draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.9, introduced by the delegation of Nigeria. We believe that the draft resolution includes matters of great importance and reflects, among other things, concerns regarding any use of nuclear wastes that would constitute radiological warfare and would pose a serious threat to the security of nations. Therefore, the appeal to all States to

take appropriate measures to ensure that any dumping of nuclear or radioactive wastes does not violate the sovereignty of States is very important, as is the request that the Conference on Disarmament intensify efforts for the adoption of a convention banning radiological weapons. We take this opportunity to reiterate our support for the creation of an ad hoc committee at the Conference on Disarmament to negotiate such a convention.

The Chairman: There being no other delegations wishing to explain their position on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.9, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.28, entitled "Measures to uphold the authority of the 1925 Geneva Protocol", under agenda item 71 (c).

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.28, entitled "Measures to uphold the authority of the 1925 Geneva Protocol", was introduced by the representative of South Africa on behalf of the member States of the Non-Aligned Movement at the 21st meeting, on 2 November 1998. As already corrected, the word "recent" in the first line of the fifth preambular paragraph has been deleted. The correction is contained in A/C.1/53/INF/3. Besides the sponsors listed in the draft resolution, additional sponsors are listed in document A/C.1/53/INF/2.

The Chairman: If no delegation wishes to explain its vote or position before a decision is taken, I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Israel, Republic of Korea, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.28 was adopted by 136 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): If no delegations wish to explain their vote or position on the draft resolution just adopted, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.38/Rev.1, under agenda item 71 (t). The draft resolution is entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction".

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.38/Rev.1, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction", was introduced by the representative of Poland at the 16th meeting on 27 October 1998. The text has been corrected in the fourth line of operative paragraph 7. The phrase "in accordance with the Convention" should read "in accordance with the provisions of the Convention". That correction is contained in document A/C.1/53/INF/3.

I also draw attention to the third preambular paragraph and the blank spaces to be filled. The Rapporteur will

include the number of additional States that have ratified the Convention and the total number of Member States of the Organization in his report on this draft resolution when it goes before the General Assembly for adoption.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of Poland on a point of order.

Mr. Tomaszewski (Poland) (*interpretation from French*): Some delegations have drawn our attention to the French text of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.38/Rev.1, the original being in English. In operative paragraph 2 the English text reads,

(*spoke in English*)

> "*Stresses* the importance of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical weapons in verifying compliance with the provisions of the Convention".

(*spoke in French*)

The French text does not correspond exactly to the English original.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of Egypt for an explanation of vote before a decision is taken on the draft resolution.

Mr. Karem (Egypt): Egypt has traditionally supported all measures leading to the promotion of international and regional stability and has always committed itself to engaging in constructive actions in fulfilment of that objective. It is in this spirit that we cannot but sympathize with the general thrust of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.38/Rev.1, as it addresses a global instrument which aims at prohibiting a whole category of weapons of mass destruction, namely, chemical weapons, thus giving the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction its effective impact in the field of disarmament as opposed to non-proliferation.

Nevertheless, Egypt would like to stress once again its well-known position vis-à-vis the Convention and its implications in the Middle East region. Our commitment, explained vividly, to the prohibition of chemical weapons and all weapons of mass destruction is best exemplified by President Mubarak's 1990 initiative on the establishment in the Middle East of a zone free from all weapons of mass destruction, which underscored the following elements: first, a total prohibition in the Middle East of all weapons of mass destruction without exception, whether nuclear, chemical or biological; secondly, that all States in the region, without exception, make a solemn declaration of regional commitments and obligations in this regard; and, thirdly, that measures for verification of compliance be underscored. This prompted the Security Council to support our initiative, as mentioned in resolution 687 (1991) and in the Security Council statement of 1992.

In July 1991, Foreign Minister Amre Moussa, in his letter addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, explained that a priority must be designated to free the Middle East of all weapons of mass destruction, increase the security of all States in the region through a lower level of armament and achieve equal and reciprocal security for all States in the region — not through a qualitative edge or military superiority, but through dialogue, negotiation, and a deep commitment to peace and equal security for all.

Although Egypt participated actively in the long and arduous negotiations that took place in the Conference on Disarmament and that led to the elaboration of the provisions of the Chemical Weapons Convention, its position has been voiced since day one, at the time of the Convention's opening for signature in January 1993 at Paris. Indeed, our standpoint emanates from and is firmly based on our regional considerations and concerns. For so long now, Israel has repeatedly stated on different occasions and in various forums that the application of this Convention should include all States in the Middle East region within a mutually accepted verification mechanism.

In all frankness, I have to admit that we are not at odds for once, and what Israel here seems to advocate agrees with us in terms of aspirations. The Government of Egypt shares this view, but in a wider spectrum not limited only to chemical weapons or only to biological weapons, but both together, along with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), to which all States of the Middle East are parties, with the exception of Israel, which continues to refuse to join and rejects the placing of its nuclear facilities under International Atomic Energy Agency full-scope safeguards. It is for that purpose, of striking the proper balance between security concerns and the interests of the States of the region, and also for the purpose of redressing the prevailing asymmetrical situation with regard to the legal obligations of the States in the Middle East, and furthermore for the purpose of being consistent with one's argument, that we urge Israel to listen to its own argument and to demonstrate political will.

For that particular reason Egypt has declined to sign the Chemical Weapons Convention until Israel joins the Non-Proliferation Treaty. We urge Israel to apply the same argument it seems to advocate and in fact employs with regard to the Chemical Weapons Convention and Biological Weapons Convention.

In conclusion, by virtue of feeling compelled to furnish cover-up arguments one unintentionally falls into the trap of self-defeating argument. We regret that this notion has characterized the actions of Israel. Egypt once again acted in good faith when it ratified the NPT in 1980 and has remained faithful to the regime since then by working to consolidate its edifice and *raison d'être*.

Despite all these considerations, my delegation has not requested a recorded vote on the draft resolution. However, we do not consider ourselves to be part of any consensus decision to be taken on this draft resolution today and would like to register our reservation on the content and letter of operative paragraph 5.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): Is there any objection to draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.38/Rev.1 being adopted without a vote?

Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.38/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their positions on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Al-Besbas (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya): My country would like to associate itself totally with the explanation made by the Egyptian delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.38/Rev.1.

Mr. Dehghani (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation joined the consensus on the draft resolution entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction", contained in document A/C.1/53/L.38/Rev.1, as orally corrected by the First Committee.

My delegation attaches great importance to the full and non-discriminatory implementation of all provisions of the Chemical Weapons Convention and firmly believes that to this end the member States should intensify their efforts within the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) so as to resolve expeditiously and in a satisfactory manner all outstanding issues.

Mr. Efrat (Israel): As in the case of last year's draft resolution, my country joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.38/Rev.1. Furthermore, Israel joins the community of nations in welcoming the entry into force of the Chemical Weapons Convention.

It is in our signature of the Convention, and, subsequently, in the active role we took in the joint endeavour to craft it into a workable mechanism, that Israel's general vision of the world in which it wishes to live is reflected. Yet it is in Israel's continuing interest to preserve the Convention's core balance between the State's duty to comply and its right to protect itself from intrusive and abusive violation of its security and its commercial and proprietary interests. By signing the Convention, Israel expressed the hope that others in its region would soon follow suit.

The reason Israel has not yet ratified the Convention is connected to the unique strategic and political environment in which we still live. At the signing ceremony in Paris in 1993, Israel's Foreign Minister openly stated Israel's position that the Chemical Weapons Convention must refer to our region and that the region at large must adhere to its principles. In that context, Israel then made it clear that it would seek to ratify the Convention subject to its regional concerns, as well as to its constitutional concerns and legislative timetable. These considerations remain no less valid today.

Israel is aware of, and indeed welcomes, the fact that certain Arab States have signed or even ratified the Convention. However, it is unfortunately also a well-known reality that none of the chemical-weapons capable, or suspected chemical-weapon armed Arab States have signed, let alone ratified, the Chemical Weapons Convention. Indeed, key known signatory Arab States have indicated collectively that they would not change their position even if Israel ratified the Convention. Among them are countries which in the past have resorted to the use of chemical weapons and which are believed to be developing capabilities in this field, even as the world is pledging to eradicate for ever all chemical weapons.

From Israel's perspective, not only have the chemical-weapons threats against it not receded in recent years, but have become more salient and acute. What I have said must not be construed as prejudging the outcome of a future Israeli decision on the matter of the ratification of or continued Israeli support for the Convention. Favourable changes in the security climate will of course favourably affect Israel's attitude and consideration of this issue.

Mr. Aldois (Yemen) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation wishes supports the comments made by the delegation of Egypt.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): As there are no further speakers, consideration of draft resolutions in cluster 2 is now concluded.

Before moving to cluster 4, I wish to remind delegations that the Secretariat would like to know today the positions of delegations regarding the postponement of votes on clusters 6 to 10 and draft resolutions A/C.1/53/L.3 and A/C.1/53/L.37 from cluster 1. If delegations have any doubts, are in negotiation or have no instructions, ask for a postponement as that would make it possible for the Chair and the Secretariat to conduct proceedings in an orderly manner. One delegation has asked for the postponement of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.40 from cluster 3. Therefore, cluster 3 will not be taken up today.

The Committee will now proceed to general statements on cluster 4, "Conventional weapons".

Mr. Mesdoua (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): On a number of occasions Algeria has expressed its concern regarding the illicit proliferation of small arms and the relationship between terrorist groups and weapons and drug traffickers. Given this situation, we believe that it is necessary to have a prompt, coordinated response from the international community that is able to deal with the challenge posed by such groups to a number of countries.

That is why Algeria thinks it is very important to have the Department for Disarmament Affairs coordinate efforts in the United Nations system. Scattered efforts would not be able to resolve all the problems posed by the illicit proliferation of small arms. Algeria supported the creation of the Department for Disarmament Affairs and plans to support its efforts, so we cannot agree that bodies other than the Department for Disarmament Affairs should come along and take up a matter that does not fall within their purview.

Mr. Dlamini (Swaziland): Swaziland, as a landlocked country, has found it necessary to speak on this item. Also, by virtue of our membership of the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, we consider that we need more efforts to be made and more assistance channelled to smaller nations, particularly developing nations, so that they can protect themselves against the illicit trafficking of small arms, which have been clearly shown to be used in the commission of crimes, including armed robbery, and assisting the toppling of Governments. Swaziland, a nation State in Africa, believes that the Convention on mercenarism has to do with an African reality, and therefore the flow of arms of this nature to our region should be totally curbed. For this reason, we appeal to the international community to assist us in curbing such tendencies.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): As no other delegation wishes to make a statement, the Committee will proceed to the consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.7 under agenda item 71 (f). The draft resolution is entitled "Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and collecting them".

Does any delegation object to that draft resolution being considered?

Mr. Sylla (Mali) (*interpretation from French*): We asked for consideration of this draft resolution to be deferred, if possible, until tomorrow morning.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): Very well. In that case, the Committee will proceed to the consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.41/Rev.1.

I call on the representative of Swaziland on a point of order.

Mr. Dlamini (Swaziland): I am speaking on a point of clarification. Earlier, when the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic was asking for the postponement of action on one of the draft resolutions in the clusters before the Committee, the Chair intimated that a time limit for giving notice to the Chair is imperative. My delegation is now confused and wonders if the Chair has shifted from that noble position, which, to my delegation, would seem to assist the Chair in successfully directing the deliberations of the Committee; delegations would cease to apply for a postponement at random, but rather through the circulation of the notices stating the reasons for such a postponement. That would alleviate the unnecessary backlog in the Committee, which would otherwise be quite pronounced.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): The deferral of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.7 is based on the fact that Mali is to circulate a revision, and inasmuch as it will be a revised version delegations will be given 24 hours to ponder and consider the text. That was the message that the Chair received.

As for the rest, I would like to recall that the position of the Chair is that we would like to be informed a day before of any request to defer voting because of lack of instructions or ongoing negotiations or simply because a delegation wants consideration to be deferred.

As to Mali's request on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.7, that request was based on the announcement of a revised text. The rules of procedure are very clear on this matter: delegations are entitled to 24 hours to consider the text. I hope that answers the delegation of Swaziland's question.

The Committee will now take up draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.41/Rev.1, entitled "Illicit traffic in small arms", under agenda item 71.

(*spoke in English*)

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.41/Rev.1, entitled "Illicit traffic in small arms", was introduced by the representative of South Africa at the 20th meeting, on 30 October 1998. A technical correction to the text was made in A/C.1/53/INF/3, as follows: in line 1 of the eleventh preambular paragraph, the words "increased cooperation" should read "increased cooperation and coordination".

In addition to the sponsors listed in the draft resolution, additional sponsors are listed in document A/C.1/53/INF/2. The Republic of the Congo has also become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of Cuba, who wishes to speak in explanation of position before a decision is taken on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.41/Rev.1.

Mr. Benítez Versón (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Cuba fully shares the concerns that motivated the main sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.41/Rev.1 to submit this new initiative to the Committee. That is why we have given our support to this draft and would like to contribute to its practical implementation while taking active part in the consultations conducted by the Secretary-General under the terms of operative paragraph 1.

At the same time, we wish to say that our support for this text does not prejudge the position of our delegation regarding the Inter-American Convention Against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Ammunition, Explosives, and other Related Materials. The entry into force of that Convention is welcomed in the sixth preambular paragraph of the text that we are about to adopt. Cuba did not participate in the negotiations on this Convention, which took place within the framework of the Organization of American States (OAS), in which my country does not participate. Furthermore, the Convention was open for signing only by States members of that Organization, so Cuba does not enjoy the right to sign it.

In addition, we believe that certain other, secondary elements in the text could be improved upon in future years. That is why we will be following its development very closely.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): If no other delegation wishes to explain its position before action is taken, we will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.41/Rev.1.

The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote. If I see no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.41/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): If no delegations wish to explain their positions on the draft resolution just adopted. The Committee will now take up cluster 5, on regional disarmament and security.

(*spoke in English*)

I call upon those delegations wishing to make general statements on that subject.

Mr. Cho (Republic of Korea): The delegation of the Republic of Korea attaches particular importance to the draft resolution on regional disarmament contained in document A/C.1/53/L.34, which is before us in cluster 5. The draft resolution, which is aimed at recognizing and promoting the crucial role of regional and subregional efforts for disarmament and arms control will serve to encourage and help facilitate the regional process. Global and regional approaches to disarmament complement each other. It is important that regional disarmament approaches should be based on the specific conditions in the region concerned. Sustained efforts to cultivate a habit of dialogue or to build confidence among the countries concerned are also indispensable for fostering a stable regional-security environment.

In the Asia-Pacific region, the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) Regional Forum (ARF), which is the only region-wide Government-level security-dialogue arrangement in the region, has served as a vehicle to uphold and promote a global disarmament approach such as the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms. The Government of the Republic of Korea has been fully committed to the ARF process and will continue actively to participate in the work of the ASEAN Regional Forum.

In North-East Asia, there is no regional process of any kind among countries despite the uncertain and fluid security climate in the region. In our view, the time is ripe for the North-East Asian countries to come up with a multilateral dialogue on peace, security and cooperation.

We believe that multilateral dialogue would help them explore ways and means of building confidence and enhance transparency and predictability for the sake of the common security and prosperity of the region. My delegation looks forward to a concrete move by the countries concerned towards the establishment of a regional security dialogue.

Having said that, we strongly support the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.34 by consensus.

Mr. Dlamini (Swaziland): My delegation fully advocates a regional disarmament centre, especially in the spirit of the resuscitation of the centre for disarmament in Africa. We hold this belief because, following the spirit of the Pelindaba Treaty, a historic Treaty that we in Africa have signed, we are clearly indicating that disarmament in our region should become a reality.

At the same time, I take the opportunity to speak to those regions that may disrupt our focused purpose, the process of disarmament in our region. Time and time again we see arms sent for sale in Africa, arms that in the long run may disrupt the peace that Africa craves. Therefore, disarmament will become a reality only if the efforts of the international community, including the United Nations, to assist us in Africa become a reality.

Mr. Laptsenak (Belarus) (*interpretation from Russian*): The tasks facing the various regions and countries in connection with fulfilling their obligations under agreements have been facilitated by the fact that the positions of Member States on questions of the maintenance of peace and security have come closer together. The new concept of security based on the disarmament process is multifaceted and now encompasses all regions, continents and countries. We believe that particular importance attaches to the question of arms control the main factor and the question of machinery for safeguarding stability and security in our continent.

We want to make our own contribution to this process by establishing a stable system of European security. As a country that has removed nuclear missiles from its territory, we consider that joint efforts should be made to ensure a secure future for the continent. One of the important factors in determining the further development of the security system in the twenty-first century is the fate of the European Community and of the regional organizations within it. If there is to be real confidence between countries rather than mere declarations, stabilization is required. This could be achieved through more active disarmament measures, reductions of military might and greater multilateral exchanges of information on military issues.

We all have the same objective: to establish a security system that would contribute in every way to reducing military might so that the spirit of partnership would be the determining factor of our security. That is the objective of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.23, which we introduced yesterday on behalf of seven other sponsors.

Finally, at the request of some delegations with which consultations are still going on, I wish to take this opportunity to ask you, Mr. Chairman, to have consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.23 deferred to a later stage.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): As no other delegation wishes to make a general statement at this stage, the Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.34, under agenda item 71 (q). The draft resolution is entitled "Regional disarmament".

Does any delegation wish to explain its position or vote before a decision is taken? I see none.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.34, entitled "Regional disarmament", was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 18th meeting, on 29 October 1998. Besides the sponsors listed in the draft resolution, additional sponsors are listed in document A/C.1/53/INF/2.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.34 have expressed

the wish that it be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to proceed accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.34 was adopted.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.35, under agenda item 71 (r). The draft resolution is entitled "Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels".

I now call on those representatives who wish to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken.

Ms. Kunadi (India): My delegation proceeds from the premise that the United Nations Disarmament Commission had undertaken a detailed consideration of regional approaches to disarmament within the context of global security and came forward with guidelines and recommendations adopted by consensus at the 1993 substantive session. Given that these guidelines exist, we question the need for yet another exercise, even in the Conference on Disarmament, which in fact is the body entrusted with the consideration of issues of global applicability.

Proposals for conventional arms control in South Asia, a reference to which is made in the sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.35, also do not carry weight. In fact, as is well known, India and Pakistan are engaged in a bilateral composite dialogue in which the first agenda item is peace and security, including confidence-building measures.

Therefore, the narrow definition in the draft resolution does not fully reflect the security concerns of all States in South Asia and adopts an approach far more restrictive than the one on which the composite bilateral dialogue is based.

For the reasons given above, we will cast a negative vote on the draft resolution.

Mr. Benítez Versón (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): As my delegation has done in the case of similar draft resolutions in previous years, it will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.35. Cuba recognizes the validity of some of the ideas contained in the text, such as the special responsibility of States with larger military capabilities in promoting agreements for regional security. However, the draft contains certain other elements that my delegation does not agree with. It strays from the guidelines and recommendations regarding regional approaches that have been adopted by the General Assembly after intensive negotiations in the Disarmament Commission.

The preambular part of the draft resolution avoids the question of the fundamental importance of effective participation by all States in the region or subregion concerned in the process of arms control that may take place. Nor is there any reference to the need to take into account the particular characteristics of each region and the legitimate national security interests of States. The text also overlooks the validity of the global process of arms control and its interrelationship with processes that at the regional and subregional levels.

As regards the operative part, we believe that any reference to the responsibilities of the Conference on Disarmament in dealing with specific items, such as conventional arms control at the subregional and regional levels, should take into account the need for that forum to do its work on the basis of the priorities established in the field of disarmament.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): If no other delegation wishes to take the floor, I will call on the Committee Secretary to conduct the voting.

A recorded vote has been requested.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.35, entitled "Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels", was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 21st meeting, on 2 November 1998. Besides the sponsors listed in the draft resolution, additional sponsors are listed in document A/C.1/53/INF/2.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya,

Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Bhutan, India

Abstaining:

Cuba

Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.35 was adopted by 129 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Angola informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I now call on the representative of Swaziland, who wishes to speak in explanation of vote on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Dlamini (Swaziland): My delegation supported the draft resolution because of its advocacy of universal control of arms at both the regional and subregional levels. In our view, through such an effort that a common denominator for the total elimination of the dangerous arms of war can be realized and achieved. In analysing the present situation in my region, my delegation fully believes that it is from such a perspective, and when such a draft resolution is taken completely seriously, that peace, which is a necessity for regional development, can be realized.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): That concludes the Committee's consideration of draft resolutions today. I thank delegations for their cooperation and now call on the Secretary, who will give a provisional summary of the requests for deferral of votes on draft resolutions in clusters 6 to 10 and the two draft resolutions I referred to in cluster 1.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): First, I shall read out the requests for voting to take place tomorrow. The four draft resolutions are A/C.1/53/L.3, L.33, L.37 and L.47.

Those are the requests for voting tomorrow on draft resolutions in clusters 1 to 5. In other words, all draft resolutions in those clusters that have so far not been voted on but on which there is a request to vote tomorrow.

The following list is of requests to postpone voting on draft resolutions in clusters 6 to 10: in cluster 6, A/C.1/53/L.4; and in cluster 7, A/C.1/53/L.5, L.46, L.12 and L.50. There are no requests for postponement in clusters 8, 9 and 10. Therefore, only five draft resolutions in clusters 6 to 10 will be postponed.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I hope that now everything is clear. There are two separate aspects to the clusters that we have considered today. Today some delegations have asked for the draft resolutions that had been postponed to be voted on tomorrow. In addition, as regards the clusters to be taken up tomorrow, some requests for postponement have already been made. Delegations that are unclear about what to do should approach the secretariat after the meeting.

Tomorrow the Committee will begin with the draft resolutions from cluster 1. If any delegation is opposed to requests for them to be considered, that too should be made known.

I call on the representative of Malaysia.

Mr. Abdullah Faiz (Malaysia): As you know, Mr. Chairman, this morning I asked for clarification on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.45. My delegation had not asked for a deferral, but as I understand it a particular delegation asked that it be deferred. My delegation has no problem with a deferral, but since we are the main sponsor of this draft resolution, that delegation should at least have had the courtesy to inform my delegation.

However, I should like to inquire here about cluster 1. Tomorrow four draft resolutions will be considered. What has happened to draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.45 and when will it be considered?

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): No request to consider A/C.1/53/L.45 tomorrow has been received. It therefore continues to be postponed.

I call on the representative of Spain.

Ms. Rico (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Before the meeting is adjourned, would it be possible for the Chairman or the Secretary read out a list of the draft resolutions that will be taken up tomorrow?

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of Japan.

Mr. Hayashi (Japan): In cluster 4, as draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.13/Rev.1 has already been distributed and as I have already introduced it, my delegation wishes action to be taken tomorrow.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): The Secretary has taken note of Japan's request.

I call on the representative of the Republic of Korea.

Mr. Cho (Republic of Korea): We fully appreciate the efforts being made by the Chair and the Secretary to help the smooth proceeding of our deliberations. However, frankly, we are still a little confused over what will be the exact programme of work tomorrow and in the coming days. As we understand it, today the Committee acted on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.14 from cluster 1. The Secretary referred a few minutes ago to requests for action on the four draft resolutions belonging to clusters 1 to 5, but when will the Committee act on the remaining draft resolutions in this category? If it is not tomorrow, when will the Committee take up these matters?

I also support the request by my colleague from Spain. To facilitate the more efficient working of the Committee and to enable the full participation of its members, whenever there is a new programme or a change of programme, perhaps that could be written on a sheet of paper and circulated among the participants in the deliberations of the Committee. I would appreciate it if the secretariat could attend to this request from my delegation.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): Just a word of explanation, if possible, in response to the delegation of the Republic of Korea. Every day we record requests for the postponement of consideration of draft resolutions. Every day we also record requests for the postponed. That is true of the draft resolutions in clusters 1 to 5 that the Secretary has just read out. If we are not informed of a request for the consideration of a draft resolution that has previously been postponed, it remains postponed.

Every day we start again with cluster 1, and every day we go from cluster 1 through to cluster 10. I hope that is clear.

Tomorrow we will begin with draft resolutions the consideration of which has been requested. However, if any such draft resolution still poses difficulties for a delegation, then that delegation should ask for a postponement. Let me take draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.3 as an example. A request had been made to take it up tomorrow; it was a draft resolution that had been postponed.

(*spoke in English*)

Now some delegations have asked that that draft resolution be put to a vote tomorrow. If there is no objection, that will be done.

If delegations have any requests for postponements they should tell the Secretariat and the requests will be noted.

Tomorrow morning the Secretary will read out the latest information about requests for postponement, and representatives will then have a clear idea of the draft resolutions the Committee will examine tomorrow.

I call on the representative of Mongolia.

Mr. Enkhsaikhan (Mongolia): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your clarification. In connection with cluster 1 issues, my delegation found that draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.10/Rev.1, presented by Mongolia, has been postponed twice. We still do not know the reason. We would really appreciate it if the secretariat could tell us whether it was for a technical reason or for any other reason. If there are no compelling reasons, we would like to have the decision taken on this draft resolution tomorrow.

The Chairman: I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): I would like to respond to some requests and appeals. First,

in regard to Japan's request for draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.13/Rev.1 to be voted on tomorrow: because this draft resolution will require a report on programme budget implications, so it has to be postponed and cannot be taken up tomorrow.

As regards Mongolia's request on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.10/Rev.1, one delegation, the Chinese, has made a request for postponement.

As for the request from Spain for a list, I would like to read out the list for the time being, taking into account all the requests either to vote tomorrow or to postpone. The list for tomorrow is, for the time being, as follows: in cluster 1, draft resolutions A/C.1/53/L.3, L.37 and L.47 are scheduled for voting tomorrow; in cluster 4, draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.33; in cluster 6, all draft resolutions will be taken up except A/C.1/53/L.4; in cluster 7, all draft resolutions will be taken up except A/C.1/53/L.5, L.12, L.46 and L.50; and in clusters 8, 9 and 10, all draft resolutions will be taken up.

The Chairman *(interpretation from French)*: I call on the representative of South Africa.

Mr. Goosen (South Africa): The issue I wish to raise is about some of the procedures that seem to be developing, and I think it might be worthwhile to see whether we cannot address them in informal consultations first before addressing the issue across the floor.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.